

RFP:

RFP-ACT-SACT-26-17

Reference:

Q&A #2

Date of Issue:

8 May 2026

The following questions were raised with respect to subject **RFP-ACT-SACT-26-17- NexGen M&S**. Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
1. How does NATO envision the long-term operating model for NexGen M&S, specifically, the balance between government ownership and contractor operation (GOCO) versus contractor-owned service provision?	The intent is to establish an SLA contract for licenses of the selected solution to include necessary maintenance and training requirements according to the proposed approach during Sprint 3.
2. What balance does NATO anticipate between capital investment (CapEx) and operational service-based (OpEx) funding models?	HQ SACT does not prescribe a specific balance between capital investment (CapEx) and operational service-based (OpEx) funding models. Bidders are expected to propose the funding model that best reflects their solution and delivery approach. The Price Proposal template provided in Enclosure 6 accommodates both CapEx and OpEx cost elements, and Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions when structuring their price proposals to ensure transparency and comparability.
3. Are there constraints within NATO funding mechanisms that would limit adoption of subscription or usage-based pricing models?	No there are no current constraints.
4. How does NATO intend to fund and manage transition from legacy M&S systems into the NexGen environment?	Down-selected bidders will provide their training plans with suggestions for transition period between IOC and FOC at the end of AP process. The price proposals (submitted at Sprint 3 & 4) should include the costs associated with managing this transition and will form part of the contract award.
5. What is NATO's expected scale of adoption across commands and nations, and how will this influence the commercial model?	The selected solution will be made available for NATO Command Structure and subordinates but not directly for individual Nations. Nations should be able to purchase their own instances from the vendor.
6. Will access to NexGen M&S be centrally funded, or will individual NATO bodies and nations act as consumers?	At FOC, it will be available to all the NATO users across NATO Command Structure. NATO bodies will pay individually for access. Nations are out of the scope of the programme.
7. Please confirm what is the expected duration of support from FOC onwards (services)?	Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with five (5) 12-month option periods.
8. Capability Requirements, NFR6 Compliance. Requirement NFR6 Compliance refers to "relevant NATO regulatory requirements." Can you please provide details and/or supporting	Bidders are not expected to demonstrate full compliance with all applicable NATO regulatory requirements at this stage of the procurement.

<p>documentation for these “relevant NATO regulatory requirements” so bidders can understand the context of these requirements.</p>	<p>NFR 6 encompasses compliance with applicable NATO regulatory requirements relevant to the NexGen M&S capability. The primary compliance framework is defined by the C3 Policy Compliance Checklist provided in Appendix 2 to Annex A of this RFP. Key governing documents include C-M(2015)0041-REV2 and its annexes covering C3 Interoperability Policy, Enterprise Architecture Policy, Cloud Computing, and Lifecycle Management policies, as well as the NATO Information Management Policy (CM(2007)0118).</p> <p>From an M&S interoperability perspective, applicable standards include STANAG 4603, STANAG 4855, STANAG 4856, STANREC 4800, STANREC 4799, STANREC 4801, STANAG 5516, STANAG 5525, and FMN Spiral 5 specifications relevant to MSaaS and C2SIM interoperability.</p> <p>Final compliance requirements will be progressively assessed and refined throughout the Agile Procurement process in coordination with relevant NATO authorities and will be part of the final SOW document.</p>
<p>9. Section 11-g of the RFP uses the term "consortium-type arrangements", in 11-h it is stated "Evidence of authority on behalf of the consortium, by the contractor, shall be enclosed and sent with any bidders' response, failure to enclose will be declared non-compliant." What is the definition of "consortium-type arrangements". Does this apply to the typical contractor/subcontractor relationship?</p>	<p>A consortium is an association of two or more businesses or organizations, forming a joint-venture, or other joining, to undertake a project or achieve a common goal that is typically too large for any single member to achieve independently. It is a temporary, contractual partnership formed to meet a specific common goal. A prime/sub-contractor relationship is hierarchical with the prime holding direct accountability for the whole project.</p> <p>No. A consortium does not apply to typical contractor/subcontractor relationship.</p>
<p>10. What is the period of performance for the total effort to be bid as part of the estimate?</p>	<p>Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with five (5) 12-month option periods.</p>
<p>11. What are Initial Operating Capability (IOC) and Full Operational Capability (FOC) dates?</p>	<p>The estimated dates for IOC (June 2027) and FOC (June 2029) are based on the contract award date. IOC begins at the time of award and FOC begins when all requirements of IOC are accomplished and accepted as completed. Similarly, FOC concludes when all requirements of FOC are achieved and accepted by the COTR on behalf of NATO.</p>
<p>12. What is the milestone criteria to achieve Initial Operating Capability (IOC) and Full Operational Capability (FOC)?</p>	<p><u>IOC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Solution selected 2. Vendor on contract 3. Fielded to the Capability Management Office, SHAPE, JWC, JFTC (stand-alone mode) <p><u>FOC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meets needs of the User 2. Legacy tools retired 3. Solution fielded to all stakeholders/users 4. Accredited and Hosted on NATO networks 5. Operators trained

	6. Database accredited through the Verification & Validation process
13. What is the location for Initial Operating Capability (IOC)?	This will be the bidder's facility and the Capability Management Office (located on Old Dominion University campus in Norfolk VA), SHAPE, JWC, and JFTC.
14. Can proposal figures and tables include font smaller than 12 font (e.g. 8- or 10-point Arial Narrow font)?	Yes, only for figures and tables.
15. Enclosure 4 states "The total page count of the Proposal shall not exceed one hundred and fifty (150) pages. This page count does not include the cover page, nor the table of contents." Are completed and signed enclosures (i.e. Enclosure 3: Past Performance Information Form & Enclosure 8 Facilities Security Clearance Details) also excluded from page count?	In this case, the Proposal refers to the Technical Proposal. It does not include the enclosures.
16. Requirement CR 1.1 references a document or a requirement DR 1.0. Can the location of DR 1.0 be provided?	DR 1.0 is internal program requirement. Within this context, CR 1.1 can be interpreted as: "NexGen M&S shall maintain current simulation functionality that is required to deliver recurring operational level exercises on time"
17. Item 3 states "Bidder proposed solution provides details about VV&A methodology and conceptual model to ensure their capability meets defined functional, performance, and operational requirements," and refers to SOO General Simulation Requirements (GSR 1-6) which does not include VV&A details. Please confirm this evaluation question applies to item 3 to Enclosure 4, section e. Verification, Validation & Acceptance (VV&A) and Conceptual Model instead?	General Simulation Requirements (GSR 1–6) in Technical Evaluation Criteria Item 3 of Annex C is provided to indicate the scope of the simulation capability against which VV&A and conceptual model adequacy will be assessed. The evaluation of Item 3 shall be conducted with reference to Enclosure 4, Section e (Verification, Validation & Acceptance (VV&A) and Conceptual Model) as the primary instructional basis for the required Technical Proposal content. Bidders are expected to describe their VV&A methodology and conceptual model in their Technical Proposal in accordance with Enclosure 4, Section e, demonstrating how their proposed solution meets the defined functional, performance, and operational requirements across the simulation capability areas.
18. Can HQ SACT provide estimations for the projected user base and/or usage that can be used for pricing consistency from Initial Operating Capability to Full Operating Capability? How many simultaneous simulation runtimes needs to be serviced?	Such parameters are expected to be further refined during the NexGen Agile Procurement phase. Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions, including licensing models and usage parameters, when preparing their price estimations to ensure transparency and comparability.
19. Can HQ SACT confirm that Agile Procurement sprint demonstrations do not require integrations/connectivity with NATO systems and/or data sources?	Bidders may be asked to integrate or connect with NATO FAS/C2 Systems (Specific C2 System to be determined) during Sprint 3 and/or Sprint 4 to prove stimulation of C2 Capabilities.
20. Can HQ SACT confirm that Agile Procurement sprint demonstrations are not expected to be in a secured/accredited cloud boundary?	Sprint demonstrations will be conducted in an unclassified environment.

<p>21. Can HQ SACT provide operational expectations (Initial Operating Capability to Full Operating Capability) for supporting multiple levels of classification (e.g. cross-domain solutions)?</p>	<p>Multiple levels of classification using cross-domain solutions is a long-term goal but not currently a requirement for FOC.</p>
<p>22. How will scaled delivery and execution capabilities required to support NATO ACT post-award from IOC to FOC be scored in Best Value determination?</p>	<p>Details for post-award from IOC to FOC will be provided later in the Agile Procurement process, during Sprint 3.</p>
<p>23. RFP Reference C and Enclosure 5 require "NAF v4 Compatible Architecture Artifacts." However, the RFP (specifically Annex A) utilizes legacy viewpoint labels (AV, OV, SV, SOV) associated with NAF v3.</p> <p>Can HQ SACT confirm that all architecture artifacts must adhere to the NAF v4 methodology? Will HQ SACT provide a mapping for the legacy terminology used in the RFP, or should bidders apply their own mapping to the corresponding NAF v4 views?</p>	<p>All architecture artifacts are expected to comply with the NATO Architecture Framework Version 4 (NAF v4) methodology, as stated in the RFP. The use of legacy viewpoint labels (AV, OV, SV, SOV), originating from NATO Architecture Framework Version 3 (NAF v3), within Annex A is intended for continuity and ease of understanding only. These references should be interpreted in line with their conceptual equivalents in NAF v4.</p> <p>HQ SACT will not provide a formal mapping between NAF v3 and NAF v4 terminology. Bidders are therefore expected to apply their own appropriate mapping and ensure that all submitted architecture artifacts are fully aligned with NAF v4 principles, including the use of the NATO Architecture Meta-Model (NMM) and relevant viewpoints.</p>
<p>24. Per RFP Section 10.b., "The Technical Proposal shall be formatted using a minimum 12-point font, single-spaced, with standard one-inch margins including page numbers."</p> <p>Would HQ SACT allow smaller font to be used in headers, footers, figures, and tables?</p>	<p>Yes. For figures and tables only.</p>
<p>25. Per RFP Section 9.b., "b. HQ SACT will not accept Bidder's proposals prepared, in whole or in part, by means of generative artificial-intelligence (AI) tools, including and without limitation to chatbots, such as Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (Chat GPT), or other language generating tools. HQ SACT reserves the right to screen applications to identify the use of such tools."</p> <p>What tools/methods will HQ SACT use to determine whether generative artificial-intelligence (AI) tools have been used?</p>	<p>The screening methodology is an internal process of the Contracting Authority.</p> <p>Bidders are responsible for ensuring full compliance with RFP Section 9.b. and are advised to prepare their proposals accordingly.</p>
<p>26. HQ SACT has indicated that the solution will be implemented within incoming NATO offerings such as NATO PBN or NATO ONX.</p> <p>Can you confirm whether the expectation is that the underlying infrastructure</p>	<p>Bidders should provide infrastructure (compute, storage, and hosting environment) requirements and cost estimations associated with them assuming they will provide the hardware.</p>

<p>(compute, storage, and hosting environment) will be procured and provided by NATO, rather than delivered by the contractor as part of the solution?</p>	
<p>27. Could HQ SACT clarify is the expectation that the contractor performs capacity planning and infrastructure sizing based on the use cases and estimated user volumes? If yes, can you provide more clarity on user volumes.</p>	<p>Capacity planning and infrastructure sizing are expected to be proposed by the Contractor based on the use cases and objectives defined in the Statement of Objectives (SOO). Specific user volumes and concurrent simulation runtime parameters will be further refined during the Agile Procurement process.</p> <p>Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions, including estimated user volumes, concurrency models, and infrastructure sizing parameters, when preparing their technical and price proposals to ensure transparency and comparability.</p>
<p>28. Could you clarify whether hyperscaler-based environments (e.g., Azure (up to RESTRICTED) or Google air-gapped (SECRET)) are considered as the primary deployment model for the solution or whether the expectation is to restrict deployment to NATO-owned and operated infrastructure?</p>	<p>Testing and accreditation are expected to be on NATO-owned and operated infrastructure. Post FOC environment is contingent on other NATO programs.</p>
<p>29. Does HQ SACT accept systems built to a member country's SECRET-level standards, or does it require its own specific criteria?</p> <p>If there are specific unique requirements, can you please share the appropriate documentation so that early system designs can be aligned to meet them?</p>	<p>Eventually the system will require NATO classified standards based on NATO guidelines.</p>
<p>30. Ref C provides a link to NAFv4 (NATO Architecture Framework (NAF)) Website URL: https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/organization/nato-structure/digital-policy) The link seems inoperable. There are also artifacts mandated from NAFv3 that have been superseded in NAFv4. Can you clarify?</p>	<p>All architecture artifacts shall comply with the NATO Architecture Framework Version 4 (NAF v4). Bidders are expected to apply the most current version of NAF v4, which is currently NAF v4.1.</p> <p>NAF v4.1 can be accessible from: https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/organization/nato-structure/digital-policy-committee-dpc/nato-architecture-framework-version</p> <p>Please check the response of Question 23 for artifacts.</p>
<p>31. Across the four application areas, what primary simulation levels (technical, tactical, operational, strategic) are expected to be addressed in Sprint 1 versus later sprints?</p>	<p>Simulation fidelity from tactical to strategic is expected to be described for Sprint 1. Demonstrations of the four application areas will be required for Sprint 3 and 4.</p>
<p>32. Does NATO envision a single, authoritative Common Synthetic Environment provided by the prime, or a federated integration of modular components, particularly in the early sprints?</p>	<p>NATO envisions a single common synthetic environment whereby the modular components will utilize the same data framework, terrain map, and sim engine.</p>

<p>33. What, if any, are the platforms or environments that this solution will be expected to network with, and utilising what data transfer methods/standards?</p>	<p>The NexGen M&S solution is expected to interoperate with NCS systems and NATO Command and Control (C2) systems, as defined in NFR 9 of the SOO. In addition, the solution shall be interoperable with related and dependent NATO capability programmes as specified under PIR 1.</p> <p>With respect to data transfer methods and standards, the solution shall support standardized interfaces and data exchange protocols in accordance with applicable NATO M&S interoperability standards, as referenced in Annex C of this RFP. For reference, Appendix 1 (CR 1.13) further identifies specific C2 systems and protocols expected to be supported, including OTH Gold, Link 16, ADatP-3, and C2SIM.</p> <p>Further details regarding specific platform integration requirements and data exchange configurations will be refined during the Agile Procurement process and will be part of the SOW document.</p>
<p>34. Are all five domains expected to be represented at a comparable level of maturity in Sprint 1, or is an incremental approach acceptable?</p>	<p>An incremental approach is acceptable with the understanding that cyber and space are difficult to model, but the proposal should mention how the vendor plans to address all five domains in the near term. Maturity in land, maritime, and air is expected.</p>
<p>35. What level of interaction is expected between simulated entities and external NATO or federated systems during early sprints?</p>	<p>There is no external NATO systems planned during the early sprints. Later sprints may include NATO C2 interoperability.</p>
<p>36. Can NATO confirm its approach to intellectual property ownership and usage rights for the solution and associated data?</p>	<p>At this time, intellectual property ownership and usage rights for the solution and associated data will comply with all HQ SACT terms and conditions:</p> <p>https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/HQ-SACT-General-Terms-and-Conditions-20260115.pdf</p> <p>Per RFP # 17, NATO reserves the right to negotiate until the conclusion of Sprint 4.</p>
<p>37. Are there reference scenarios (e.g. scale, entity counts, time horizons) that NATO uses to benchmark expected performance or scalability?</p>	<p>Reference scenarios with scale, entity counts, and time horizons will be provided prior to Sprint 3 for demonstrations and further discussions regarding expected performance and scalability.</p>
<p>38. What level of interoperability with existing NATO and national systems is expected in early phases versus longer term delivery?</p>	<p>NATO C2 system interoperability is expected in the short term. However, interoperability with national systems is not a requirement for this Programme.</p>
<p>39. How does NATO envision balancing fidelity vs scalability across the different application areas (CAX, planning, wargaming, analysis)?</p>	<p>NATO envisions matching fidelity and scalability to the analytical purpose of each application area rather than applying a single standard across all uses. CAX prioritizes scalability and execution speed; operational planning prioritizes rapid configurability; wargaming balances fidelity with human decision cycles; and analysis prioritizes resolution at the appropriate level of the model hierarchy.</p>

40. To what extent is the Common Synthetic Environment expected to be authoritative vs federated?	NATO envisions a single common synthetic environment whereby the modular components will utilize the same data framework, terrain map, and sim engine.
41. What are the expectations regarding representation of human decision-making and cognitive effects within simulations?	Given that these types of effects are not commonplace in the M&S field, NATO is looking for innovative ways to model human decision-making and cognitive effects.
42. We have contacted the Commercial Contacts regarding a DoE; can you provide a timeline for when these will be approved?	NATO HQ SACT is not privy to that information.
43. Thank you for confirming only a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost is required. Please may ACT provide confirmation that this ROM cost is for the entire multi-year delivery, including all optional periods (i.e. 10 years)?	Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions when structuring their price proposals to ensure transparency and comparability. Bidders should limit proposals to the identified period.
<p>44. To ensure we generate a fair, realistic and comparable Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) cost for the multi-year delivery and managed service, please may NATO ACT provide the following information to enable a consistent basis for pricing between tenderers:</p> <p>a. target infrastructure and hosting requirements: Expected scalability, performance, and data storage needs. Details of existing on-premise and cloud infrastructure and specific requirements for new hardware and environment setup.</p> <p>b. user and usage profiling: Anticipated total number of users, concurrent users, and expected peak usage patterns.</p> <p>c. workload and system load expectations: Expected transaction throughput, and computational intensity of typical user and system operations. Outline of the core features and functionalities required.</p> <p>d. licensing and 3rd party integration dependencies: Any required commercial software licenses (e.g., operating systems, databases, middleware) that must be purchased or APIs that must be utilised.</p> <p>e. NATO Furnished Assets that the Supplier can utilise in the form of platforms, systems, access, software."</p>	<p>Bidders should provide infrastructure (compute, storage, and hosting environment) requirements and cost estimations associated with them assuming they will provide the hardware.</p> <p>NATO- owned and operated infrastructure will be used.</p> <p>Such parameters are expected to be further refined during the NexGen Agile Procurement phase.</p> <p>Bidders are requested to clearly state their underlying assumptions, including licensing models and usage parameters, when preparing their price estimations to ensure transparency and comparability.</p> <p>Bidders should assume there will not be any NATO furnished assets other than data.</p>
45. Thank you for clarifying the primary deployment environment in Q&A #1 document Q8. Please may ACT provide clarification if this answer means pricing ROM costs should only factor in	NexGen M&S solution is planned to be available on both PBN and ONX once they are available NATO-wide. Bidders should plan for deployment on current NU and NS networks until those networks are up and running.

development and deployment on NATO PBN / NATO ONX / Both PBN and ONX?	
46. In response to the answers to Q&A #1 document Q8 and Q33, please may ACT provide instructions for factoring in the pricing for provisioning of services (PBN/ONX) that are still in procurement phases, or requirements that are undefined, into the multi-year ROM? This guidance will enable consistency and comparability across proposals.	Bidders should plan for deployment on current NU and NS networks until PBN and ONX networks are up and running.
47. Please may ACT provide clarification on the total contract length, including the initial period and potential extension options? In the Q&A #1 document: Q12 answer states "HQ estimates a 5-year period of performance from contract award", but Q24 answer states "Initial contract will be for 2 years with 8 years of optional periods."	Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with five (5) 12-month option periods.
48. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.3, is there a current standard input/output ORBAT format required and can NATO ACT provide an example or reference to the Standard?	The current data standard reference for NATO is SISO-REF-010-2025 : Reference for Enumerations for Simulation Interoperability (v 36). NATO's current input/output ORBAT format is Extensible Markup Language (XML). Refer to the Data Management Policies contained in rfp026017_apdx2
49. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.3, what is the bidders role in re-defining the ORBAT generation process?	Bidders should develop an understanding of current ORBAT generation practices and determine efficient ways to manage ORBAT generation and refinement within their proposed data framework.
50. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.7, is there an expectation to re-produce/create/maintain the country books or will this be provided by NATO as Government Furnished Assets?	The current NATO produced data will be provided as Government Furnished Assets, but NATO's expectation is that these products can be created and maintained within the NexGen M&S solution.
51. In rfp026017_apdx1, in reference to ID CR 1.14, please may you provide a list of all NATO approved C2 and FAS services that may require integration and the associated integration standards (are these only the standards listed in CR 1.13)?	CR 1.14 requires interoperability with NATO-approved C2 and FAS services, including NATO-approved national systems. A definitive list of all applicable NATO-approved C2 and FAS services is not provided at this stage of the procurement, as the specific integration requirements will be defined during the Agile Procurement process in coordination with relevant NATO stakeholders. The standards listed in CR 1.13, including OTH Gold, Link 16, ADatP-3, C2SIM, and applicable STANAGs and STANRECs, are referenced in the context of C2 stimulation interoperability and should be considered indicative rather than exhaustive. Further details regarding specific platform integration requirements and data exchange configurations will be refined during the Agile Procurement process and will be part of the SOW document.
52. Reference RFP-ACT-SCT-26-17, Q&A #1, dated 27APR26. Please clarify the NexGen's Period of Performance (PoP)	Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with five (5) 12-month option periods.

<p>described in the answers provided in response to Question #s 12 & 24.</p>	
<p>53. Are there any specific 'member-nation' only restrictions for subcontractors who will provide non-sensitive, off-the-shelf components?</p>	<p>In accordance with RFP # 4, all eligibility requirements apply to both prime Contractors and subcontractors, without exception for the nature of the components or services provided. Bidders are responsible for ensuring that all proposed subcontractors, or consortium members, regardless of the scope of their contribution, meet the eligibility criteria set forth in Section 4.</p>
<p>54. There is currently no content outlining IP considerations.</p> <p>55. What is the distinction between 'Background IP' and Foreground IP' as it relates to commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software integrated into the final solution?</p>	<p>At this time, intellectual property considerations, ownership and usage rights for the proposed solution and associated data will comply with all HQ SACT terms and conditions:</p> <p>https://www.act.nato.int/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/HQ-SACT-General-Terms-and-Conditions-20260115.pdf</p> <p>Per RFP # 17, NATO reserves the right to negotiate until the conclusion of Sprint 4.</p>
<p>56. Section 2. Background states: "...and resulting in a Capability Programme Plan (CPP) to enable governance approval, resourcing, and delivery."</p> <p>57. Can you confirm that Appendix 2 encompasses the governance approved post CPP completion? If not, can you provide the governance to which you referred in Section 2</p>	<p>Section 2 refers to Military Committee and NAC. Where Appendix 2 defines the C3 Policy Compliance Checklist, which establishes the regulatory and interoperability requirements that the proposed NexGen M&S solution shall comply with.</p>
<p>58. RFP Section 4.f. states: Bidder's personnel will be required to hold NATO or National SECRET Personnel Security Clearance (PSC) at the time of award. Additionally, a Facilities Security Clearance (FSC) will be required for contract award for Prime and Sub-Contractor companies at NATO or National SECRET or above. While this is not required during the AP process, interested bidders successfully down selected in Sprint 1 are encouraged to initiate this process immediately if they currently do not meet this eligibility requirement. An active FSC will be a requirement for contract award. (See Enclosures 7 & 8)</p> <p>NFR 4 states: NexGen M&S shall be deployable on NATO Unclassified (NU), NATO Secret (NS), and Mission Secret (MS) networks and shall implement robust security controls, including role- and permission-based access control, authentication, authorization, encryption, and auditing mechanisms, to protect data,</p>	<p>The Contractor shall manage the full NATO Security Accreditation process in coordination with CMO, providing all required documentation and artifacts as listed under the Security Accreditation Package defined in SOO Section 6.1. Specific accreditation requirements and applicable NATO security directives will be confirmed during the Agile Procurement process in coordination with the relevant NATO security authorities.</p> <p>NexGen M&S solution must be able to process information at NATO S3CR3T level.</p> <p>NATO - owned and operated infrastructure will be used.</p>

<p>services, and interfaces against unauthorized access and to ensure compliance with applicable NATO security policies and standards.</p> <p>What specific security classification level and accreditation standard will be required of the computer systems for contract performance? Specifically, will the contractor be responsible for creating, managing, maintaining a classified computer system, or will the client furnish, manage and maintain any and all classified systems for this contract?</p> <p>Please confirm whether the work on computer systems involves CUI only (FCI/CMMC Level 2), classified U.S. Government information, or NATO-classified information (e.g., NATO Restricted, NATO Confidential, NATO Secret, or COSMIC Top Secret), and identify the required accreditation authority (DCSA, NSA, NATO Security Authority, etc.).</p>	
<p>59. Both Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of the SOO provide basic guidance that the contractor is responsible for aligning the solution to cybersecurity and C3 policies</p> <p>What cybersecurity framework and compliance standards will govern contract execution?</p> <p>Please clarify whether compliance will be assessed against CMMC Level 2/3, NIST SP 800-171 Rev. 2, NIST SP 800-172, RMF, CNSSI, NATO INFOSEC directives, or other agency-specific security controls.</p>	<p>The NexGen M&S solution shall comply with applicable NATO cybersecurity policies, directives, and standards. National frameworks are not mandated under this RFP.</p> <p>C3 compliance requirements are defined in the C3 Policy Compliance Checklist provided as Appendix 2 to Annex A. Bidders are responsible for ensuring solution alignment with this checklist and for addressing any identified compliance gaps.</p> <p>The Contractor shall plan, conduct, and document all cybersecurity testing and validation activities as required under Enclosure 4. Following contract award, the Contractor shall manage the full NATO Security Accreditation process, providing all artifacts listed under SOO Section 6.1. Specific accreditation requirements will be confirmed during the Agile Procurement process in coordination with the relevant NATO security authorities.</p>
<p>60. Q&A 12. Please may ACT advise on the total contract duration and budget for delivery of the NGMS solution (i.e. post Sprint 4)?</p> <p>HQ estimates a 5-year period of performance from contract award. While award value is difficult to estimate exactly since the solution will largely be shaped through the Agile Procurement Process, HQ SACT estimates a value between 100M-150M EUR.</p>	<p>Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with five (5) 12-month option periods.</p>

<p>61. What is NATO's current thinking regarding the period of performance, including base period and option years, for both initial delivery and ongoing support? Initial contract will be for 2 years with 8 years of optional periods.</p> <p>The answer to question 12 states the anticipated contract duration as a 5-year POP. However, the answer to question 24 states the anticipated contract duration as a 2-year base with 8 option years.</p> <p>Can you please clarify the anticipated contract duration for pricing purposes?</p>	<p>Base period of performance is contract award through FOC (estimated June 2027 – December 2029) with five (5) 12-month option periods.</p>
--	--